# Contribution of right-handed neutrinos and standard fermions to $W^\pm$ and $Z$ masses

Petr Beneš
*Institute of Experimental and Applied Physics, Czech Technical University in Prague, Horská 3a/22, 128 00 Prague 2, Czech Republic**

We present expressions of the Pagels–Stokar type for the masses of the $W^\pm$ and $Z$ bosons in terms of the quark and lepton self-energies. By introducing a genuine new term in the gauge boson–fermion–anti-fermion vertex we manage to accomplish three main achievements: First, we show that the similar results existing in literature lead, in general, to a non-symmetric gauge boson mass matrix and we fix this flaw. Second, we consider the case of any number of fermion generations with general mixing. Third, we include in our analysis also an arbitrary number of right-handed neutrinos, together with the left-handed and right-handed neutrino Majorana masses (self-energies). On top of that, we give also a correction to the original Pagels–Stokar formula for the pion decay constant in QCD.

PACS numbers: 11.15.Ex, 11.30.Qc, 14.60.St
Keywords: Pagels–Stokar formula; Gauge boson masses; Higgs mechanism; Dynamical mass generation; right-handed neutrinos; Majorana neutrinos

arXiv:1402.5055v1 [hep-ph] 20 Feb 2014

## I. INTRODUCTION

The mechanism of spontaneous symmetry breaking is one of the most important issues of QFT. It is usually assumed to be triggered either by condensation of elementary scalar or by fermion condensates (i.e., more generally, by their dynamically generated masses or self-energies). The latter is the mechanism of chiral symmetry breaking in QCD and is assumed to happen also, e.g., in the Technicolor theories.

Similar mechanism can be in principle responsible also for the electroweak symmetry breaking in the Standard Model. Indeed, if, by means of some dynamics, the quarks and leptons obtain masses, they will inevitably break the electroweak symmetry. This idea dates back to the old top-condensations models [1–3] and has been alive ever since.

If the electroweak symmetry is broken, the $W^\pm$ and $Z$ bosons must obtain masses, proportional to the particular order parameters, i.e., in our case the dynamically generated quark and lepton self-energies. In this letter we present explicit formulae for these masses in terms of the self-energies. We take into account not only the Standard Model fermions, but, motivated by recent studies [4, 5], also the right-handed neutrinos.

The letter is organized as follows: First in Sec. II we review the traditional approach [6, 7] of tackling this problem on a toy example of Abelian axial symmetry. Next in Sec. III we introduce our principal improvement that will allow us in Sec. IV to apply the method consistently on the electroweak symmetry breaking. In Sec. V we compare our results with those in literature and we conclude in Sec. VI.

## II. REVIEW OF TRADITIONAL APPROACH

Consider a theory with Abelian axial $\mathbb{U}(1)_\mathrm{A}$ gauge symmetry, containing a single[1] fermion flavor $\psi$, charged under it. The corresponding symmetry generator is defined with the gauge coupling constant $g$ deliberately included: $T_\mathrm{A} = g\gamma_5$.

Assume further that the fermion obtains somehow (by means of the $\mathbb{U}(1)_\mathrm{A}$ dynamic itself or by some other dynamics) the proper self-energy $-\mathrm{i}\mathbf{\Sigma}_p = \langle\psi\bar{\psi}\rangle_{1\mathrm{PI}}$. Let us for the simplicity make two technical assumptions: First, that $\mathbf{\Sigma}_p$ is a function only of $p^2$ (and not of $\not{p}$) and second, that it is Hermitian in the sense $\mathbf{\Sigma}_p = \gamma_0\mathbf{\Sigma}_p^\dagger\gamma_0$. These assumptions constrain $\mathbf{\Sigma}_p$ to have the form

$$\mathbf{\Sigma}_p = \Sigma_p^* P_L + \Sigma_p P_R\,, \tag{1}$$

where $\Sigma_p$ is a complex function of $p^2$ and $P_{R,L} = (1 \pm \gamma_5)/2$.

Such a non-vanishing $\mathbf{\Sigma}_p$ breaks spontaneously the $\mathbb{U}(1)_\mathrm{A}$ gauge symmetry and the corresponding gauge boson thus must acquire a mass. This mass can be obtained from the polarization tensor, which is necessarily of the transversal form $\Pi^{\mu\nu}(q) = (g^{\mu\nu}q^2 - q^\mu q^\nu)\Pi(q^2)$. If the form factor $\Pi(q^2)$ develops a pole of the type $1/q^2$, its residue is (in the lowest approximation) just the gauge boson mass squared.

As argued in [6], the polarization tensor with the desired pole can be calculated from one-loop fermion contribution, with the propagators given by $G_p = (\not{p} - \mathbf{\Sigma}_p)^{-1}$, with one insertion of a the bare vertex $\gamma^\mu T_\mathrm{A}$ and with the other insertion of the dressed vertex $\Gamma^\mu(p', p)$ (see Fig. 1). The point is that $\Gamma^\mu(p', p)$ must satisfy the

* p.benes@utef.cvut.cz

[1] Ignoring the axial anomaly does not affect the reasoning in this section.




Figure 1. The polarization tensor $\Pi^{\mu\nu}(q)$. The full blobs stand for the full propagators, while the gray blob is the proper (1PI) vertex function.

Ward–Takahashi (WT) identity

$$q_\mu \Gamma^\mu(p',p) = G_{p'}^{-1} T_\mathrm{A} - \gamma_0 T_\mathrm{A} \gamma_0 G_p^{-1} \tag{2a}$$

$$= g\not{q}\gamma_5 - g(\mathbf{\Sigma}_{p'} + \mathbf{\Sigma}_p)\gamma_5\,, \tag{2b}$$

where $q = p' - p$. The WT identity has two consequences. First, it guarantees transversality of the polarization tensor. Second, it implies that, as long as $\mathbf{\Sigma}_p \neq 0$, the vertex $\Gamma^\mu(p',p)$ must have a pole of the type "$1/q$". It is attributed to the intermediate "would-be" Nambu–Goldstone (NG) boson, corresponding to spontaneous breakdown of the $\mathbb{U}(1)_\mathrm{A}$ symmetry, and thus must be of the form $q^\mu/q^2$. This pole in the vertex gives in turn rise to the pole in $\Pi(q^2)$ and thus to the gauge boson mass.

The last ingredient we need is hence the dressed vertex $\Gamma^\mu(p',p)$. Due to the requirement of the WT identity and correct interpretability of the pole in terms of the intermediate NG boson the dressed vertex must have the general form of the bare vertex plus the NG pole part plus a transversal part:

$$\Gamma^\mu(p',p) = g\gamma^\mu\gamma_5 - g\frac{q^\mu}{q^2}(\mathbf{\Sigma}_{p'} + \mathbf{\Sigma}_p)\gamma_5 + \tilde{\Gamma}^\mu(p',p)\,, \tag{3}$$

where $q_\mu \tilde{\Gamma}^\mu(p',p) = 0$.

In [7] it is argued that $\Gamma^\mu(p',p)$ can be actually neglected:

$$\tilde{\Gamma}^\mu(p',p) = 0\,. \tag{4}$$

The argument is that since $\tilde{\Gamma}^\mu(p',p)$ is transversal, it does not contain the NG pole ($\sim q^\mu/q^2$). Therefore it can be safely ignored, because it does not contribute to the gauge boson mass (which is approximated by the residue of the pole of $\Pi(q^2)$).

Now, having the dressed vertex (3) together with (4), the gauge boson mass $m$ can be straightforwardly calculated using the approach described above. The result can be written as $m = gF_\pi$, where the NG boson ("pion") decay constant $F_\pi$ is

$$F_\pi^2 = -2\mathrm{i}\int \frac{\mathrm{d}^4p}{(2\pi)^4} \frac{|\Sigma_p|^2 - \frac{1}{4}p^2|\Sigma_p|^{2\prime}}{(p^2 - |\Sigma_p|^2)^2}\,, \tag{5}$$

where the prime denotes derivative with respect to $p^2$. This expression for $F_\pi$ is, up to the missing color and flavor number factors, known as the Pagels–Stokar (PS) formula [7].

## III. NOVEL POLE TERM

It is certainly true that transversality of $\tilde{\Gamma}^\mu(p',p)$ does not imply a massless pole. On the other hand, it does not necessarily mean that such a pole in $\tilde{\Gamma}^\mu(p',p)$ cannot exist. Indeed, we argue that $\tilde{\Gamma}^\mu(p',p)$ can have the NG pole:

$$\tilde{\Gamma}^\mu(p',p) = 2xgT^\mu(p',p)\frac{\mathbf{\Sigma}_{p'} - \mathbf{\Sigma}_p}{p'^2 - p^2}\gamma_5\,, \tag{6}$$

where we defined the transversal quantity

$$T^\mu(p',p) = \frac{q^\mu}{q^2}[\not{q},\not{q}'] - [\gamma^\mu,\not{q}'] \tag{7}$$

and $q' = p' + p$. Notice the appearance of the parameter $x$, which is now in principle arbitrary real constant. The vertex (6) does not contain any other poles that the NG pole at $q^2 \to 0$: The potential pole at $p'^2 \to p^2$ is canceled by zero in numerator as $\mathbf{\Sigma}_{p'} \to \mathbf{\Sigma}_p$ and for the fraction one just obtains $\mathbf{\Sigma}'_p$. The vertex is also linear in $\mathbf{\Sigma}_p$ and $\mathbf{\Sigma}_{p'}$, which is fully consistent with the lowest order of the "dynamical perturbation theory", defined in [7].

Upon accepting the non-vanishing value (6) of $\tilde{\Gamma}^\mu(p',p)$ the PS formula (5) modifies as

$$F_\pi^2 = -2\mathrm{i}\int \frac{\mathrm{d}^4p}{(2\pi)^4} \frac{|\Sigma_p|^2 - \frac{1}{4}(1-12x)p^2|\Sigma_p|^{2\prime}}{(p^2 - |\Sigma_p|^2)^2}\,. \tag{8}$$

Note that all we obtained in this simple Abelian model from generalizing the traditional approach by taking (6) is merely an ambiguity in $F_\pi^2$, with no clue which value of $x$ should be the preferred one. In the following section we will see that considering a more complicated non-Abelian theory will allow us to argue on physical grounds in favor of a particular (non-vanishing) value of $x$.

## IV. ELECTROWEAK GAUGE BOSONS

Let us now consider the electroweak theory. To be as general as possible, we will assume $n$ generations of the standard $\mathbb{SU}(2)_\mathrm{L} \times \mathbb{U}(1)_\mathrm{Y}$ fermion multiplets and $m$ singlets, a.k.a. the right-handed neutrinos.

We first assume that some dynamics, which we do not need to specify, generates the fermion self-energies, breaking the electroweak symmetry $\mathbb{SU}(2)_\mathrm{L}\times\mathbb{U}(1)_\mathrm{Y}$ down to the electromagnetic $\mathbb{U}(1)_\mathrm{em}$. For the charged fermions $f = f_L + f_R$ we assume the self-energies $-\mathrm{i}\mathbf{\Sigma}_f = \langle f\bar{f}\rangle_\mathrm{1PI}$ to have the form

$$\mathbf{\Sigma}_f = \Sigma_f^\dagger P_L + \Sigma_f P_R\,, \qquad f = u,d,e\,, \tag{9}$$

where $\Sigma_f$ are complex $p^2$-dependent $n \times n$ matrices.[2]

[2] In this section we will usually suppress the momentum dependence of the self-energies and assume it implicitly.

For the neutrinos one must take into account the possibility that they can acquire, due to their electric neutrality, not only the Dirac, but also the left- and right-handed Majorana self-energies. This is most conveniently accomplished by putting the neutrinos of both chiralities into the same multiplet, the Nambu–Gorkov doublet

$$\Psi_\nu = \begin{pmatrix} \nu_L + (\nu_L)^{\rm c} \\ \nu_R + (\nu_R)^{\rm c} \end{pmatrix}, \tag{10}$$

and by considering the self-energy $-\mathrm{i}\mathbf{\Sigma}_{\Psi_\nu} = \langle \Psi_\nu \bar{\Psi}_\nu \rangle_{1\mathrm{PI}}$ again of the form

$$\mathbf{\Sigma}_{\Psi_\nu} = \Sigma^\dagger_{\Psi_\nu} P_L + \Sigma_{\Psi_\nu} P_R \,, \tag{11}$$

where $\Sigma_{\Psi_\nu}$ is a complex $(n+m)\times(n+m)$ $p^2$-dependent matrix, which is symmetric due to $\Psi^{\rm c}_\nu = \Psi_\nu$. The point is that it naturally contains the Dirac self-energy $-\mathrm{i}\Sigma_{\nu D} P_R = \langle \nu_L \bar{\nu}_R \rangle_{1\mathrm{PI}}$, as well as the two Majorana self-energies $-\mathrm{i}\Sigma_{\nu L} P_R = \langle \nu_L (\bar{\nu}_L)^{\rm c} \rangle_{1\mathrm{PI}}$ and $-\mathrm{i}\Sigma_{\nu R} P_R = \langle (\nu_R)^{\rm c} \bar{\nu}_R \rangle_{1\mathrm{PI}}$:

$$\Sigma_{\Psi_\nu} = \begin{pmatrix} \Sigma_{\nu L} & \Sigma_{\nu D} \\ \Sigma^{\rm T}_{\nu D} & \Sigma_{\nu R} \end{pmatrix}, \tag{12}$$

where the matrices $\Sigma_{\nu D}$, $\Sigma_{\nu L}$, $\Sigma_{\nu R}$ have the dimensions $n\times m$, $n\times n$, $m\times m$, respectively, and $\Sigma_{\nu L}$ and $\Sigma_{\nu R}$ are symmetric.

To proceed further, we need the dressed vertices of the fermion–anti-fermion pairs with the electroweak gauge bosons. They can be derived by similar reasoning as in the previous Abelian case, i.e., by demanding satisfaction of the WT identities, correct transformation properties under both the continuous and discrete symmetries, Hermiticity, linearity in the fermion self-energies (evaluated only in $p'$ and $p$), linearity in symmetry generators and gauge coupling constants and no poles but the NG ones with correct residues. Again we end up with vertices which are unique up to the ambiguous transversal parts of the type (6), proportional to the yet undetermined constant $x$.

For the sake of illustration, we present here explicitly only the quark vertices; the lepton vertices would be notationally more complicated due to the Majorana character of neutrinos, but otherwise completely analogous. In the physical $(\gamma, Z, W^+, W^-)$ basis the vertices read

$$\Gamma^\mu_\gamma(p',p) = eQ_f \left\{ \gamma^\mu - \frac{q'^\mu}{q\cdot q'} \mathbf{\Sigma}_{f-} \right\}, \tag{13}$$

$$\Gamma^\mu_Z(p',p) = \frac{g}{2\cos\theta_{\rm W}} \left\{ \gamma^\mu (v_f - t_{3f}\gamma_5) + \frac{q^\mu}{q^2} t_{3f} \mathbf{\Sigma}_{f+}\gamma_5 - \frac{q'^\mu}{q\cdot q'} v_f \mathbf{\Sigma}_{f-} - 2x \frac{T^\mu(p',p)}{q\cdot q'} t_{3f} \mathbf{\Sigma}_{f-}\gamma_5 \right\}, \tag{14}$$

$$\Gamma^\mu_{W^+}(p',p) = \frac{g}{\sqrt{2}} \left\{ \gamma^\mu P_L - \frac{1}{2}\frac{q^\mu}{q^2}\big(\mathbf{\Sigma}_{d+}P_L - \mathbf{\Sigma}_{u+}P_R\big) - \frac{1}{2}\frac{q'^\mu}{q\cdot q'}\big(\mathbf{\Sigma}_{d-}P_L + \mathbf{\Sigma}_{u-}P_R\big) + x\frac{T^\mu(p',p)}{q\cdot q'}\big(\mathbf{\Sigma}_{d-}P_L - \mathbf{\Sigma}_{u-}P_R\big) \right\} \tag{15}$$

and $\Gamma^\mu_{W^-}(p',p) = \gamma_0 \Gamma^{\mu\dagger}_{W^+}(p,p')\gamma_0$. We denoted $\mathbf{\Sigma}_{f\pm} = \mathbf{\Sigma}_f(p'^2) \pm \mathbf{\Sigma}_f(p^2)$ and $v_f = t_{3f} - 2Q_f \sin^2\theta_{\rm W}$.

As a net result we obtain the gauge boson mass matrix in the form

$$M^2 = \begin{pmatrix} M^2_{W^\pm} & 0 \\ 0 & M^2_{Z\gamma} \end{pmatrix}, \tag{16}$$

where in the $(A^\mu_1, A^\mu_2, A^\mu_3, B^\mu)$ basis we have

$$M^2_{W^\pm} = \begin{pmatrix} g^2 & 0 \\ 0 & g^2 \end{pmatrix} \left[ F^2_\pm + (1+12x)\tilde{F}^2_\pm \right] + \begin{pmatrix} 0 & g^2 \\ -g^2 & 0 \end{pmatrix} (1+12x)\tilde{G}^2_\pm \,, \tag{17}$$

$$M^2_{Z\gamma} = \begin{pmatrix} g^2 & -gg' \\ -gg' & g'^2 \end{pmatrix} \left[ F^2_0 + (1+12x)\tilde{F}^2_0 \right], \tag{18}$$

where the form factor $F^2_\pm$, $\tilde{F}^2_\pm$, $\tilde{G}^2_\pm$, $F^2_0$, $\tilde{F}^2_0$ are independent of $g$, $g'$ and $x$ and are in general non-vanishing.

Now we can spot the problem: The mass matrix (17) for the $W^\pm$ bosons is not symmetric! This is indeed a pathological situation, as it implies, e.g., different masses for the $W^+$ and $W^-$ bosons: $m^2_{W^+} - m^2_{W^-} = 2g^2(1+12x)\tilde{G}^2_\pm$. The form factor $\tilde{G}^2_\pm$ is explicitly

$$\tilde{G}^2_\pm = \frac{1}{8} N_c \int \frac{\mathrm{d}^4 p}{(2\pi)^4} p^2 \,\mathrm{Tr} \left\{ D_{dL} \Big( D_{uL} \Sigma_u \Sigma^{\dagger\prime}_u - \Sigma'_u \Sigma^\dagger_u D_{uL} \Big) - (u \leftrightarrow d) \right\} + (\text{similar contribution of leptons}) \,, \tag{19}$$

where $N_c = 3$ and $D_{fL}$, $f = u, d, e$, denotes

$$D_{fL} = \big(p^2 - \Sigma_f \Sigma^\dagger_f\big)^{-1} . \tag{20}$$

(The subscript $L$ is here only to distinguish it from the related, yet different quantity $D_{fR} = (p^2 - \Sigma^\dagger_f \Sigma_f)^{-1}$.)

From (19) we can see that $G^2_\pm$ indeed, in general, does not vanish. In fact, there are special cases when $G^2_\pm$ does vanish: E.g., when there is just one generation and at the same time the self-energies $\Sigma_u$, $\Sigma_d$ are real. But for generic self-energies $G^2_\pm$ does not vanish.

Now the free constant $x$ comes into play. By setting

$$x = -\frac{1}{12} \tag{21}$$

we can get rid of the unwanted antisymmetric part of $M^2_{W^\pm}$, irrespective of the actual value of $\tilde{G}^2_\pm$. The $W^\pm$ and $Z$ masses then read

$$m^2_W = g^2 F^2_\pm \,, \tag{22a}$$
$$m^2_Z = (g^2 + g'^2) F^2_0 \,. \tag{22b}$$

The form factors $F^2_\pm$ and $F^2_0$ are given by the sum rules

$$F^2_\pm = \mu^2_q + \mu^2_\ell \,, \tag{23a}$$
$$F^2_0 = \mu^2_u + \mu^2_d + \mu^2_\nu + \mu^2_e \,, \tag{23b}$$

where the particular contributions of $F^2_0$ are explicitly

$$\mu^2_f = -\mathrm{i}\frac{1}{2} N_c \int \frac{\mathrm{d}^4 p}{(2\pi)^4}\ \mathrm{Tr}\left\{ \Big[ \big(\Sigma_f \Sigma^\dagger_f\big) - \frac{1}{2} p^2 \big(\Sigma_f \Sigma^\dagger_f\big)' \Big] D^2_{fL} \right\}, \tag{24}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mu^2_\nu = -\mathrm{i}\frac{1}{2} \int \frac{\mathrm{d}^4 p}{(2\pi)^4}\ \mathrm{Tr}\Bigg\{ & \Big[ \big(\Sigma_{\nu D} \Sigma^\dagger_{\nu D}\big) - \frac{1}{2} p^2 \big(\Sigma_{\nu D} \Sigma^\dagger_{\nu D}\big)' \Big] D^2_{\nu L} \\
& + 2 \Big[ \big(\Sigma_{\nu L} \Sigma^\dagger_{\nu L}\big) - \frac{1}{2} p^2 \big(\Sigma_{\nu L} \Sigma^\dagger_{\nu L}\big)' \Big] D^2_{\nu L} \\
& + \frac{1}{2} \Bigg( 3 \Big[ \big(\Sigma^{\mathrm{T}}_{\nu D} \Sigma^\dagger_{\nu L}\big) - \frac{1}{2} p^2 \big(\Sigma^{\mathrm{T}}_{\nu D} \Sigma^\dagger_{\nu L}\big)' \Big] D_{\nu L} D_{\nu M} - \frac{1}{2} p^2 \big(\Sigma^{\mathrm{T}}_{\nu D} \Sigma^\dagger_{\nu L}\big) \big( D_{\nu L} D'_{\nu M} - D'_{\nu L} D_{\nu M} \big) + \mathrm{h.c.} \Bigg) \\
& + \frac{1}{2} \Bigg( \Big[ \big(\Sigma_{\nu R} \Sigma^\dagger_{\nu D}\big) - \frac{1}{2} p^2 \big(\Sigma_{\nu R} \Sigma^\dagger_{\nu D}\big)' \Big] D_{\nu L} D_{\nu M} - \frac{1}{2} p^2 \big(\Sigma_{\nu R} \Sigma^\dagger_{\nu D}\big) \big( D_{\nu L} D'_{\nu M} - D'_{\nu L} D_{\nu M} \big) + \mathrm{h.c.} \Bigg) \Bigg\},
\end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

where $N_c = 3$ for $f = u, d$ and $N_c = 1$ for $f = e$, and the contributions of $F^2_\pm$ are

$$\begin{aligned}
\mu^2_q = -\mathrm{i}\frac{1}{2} N_c \int \frac{\mathrm{d}^4 p}{(2\pi)^4}\ \mathrm{Tr}\Bigg\{ & \Big[ \big(\Sigma_u \Sigma^\dagger_u\big) - \frac{1}{2} p^2 \big(\Sigma_u \Sigma^\dagger_u\big)' \Big] D_{dL} D_{uL} - \frac{1}{2} p^2 \big(\Sigma_u \Sigma^\dagger_u\big) \Big[ D_{dL} D'_{uL} - D'_{dL} D_{uL} \Big] \\
& + \Big[ \big(\Sigma_d \Sigma^\dagger_d\big) - \frac{1}{2} p^2 \big(\Sigma_d \Sigma^\dagger_d\big)' \Big] D_{uL} D_{dL} - \frac{1}{2} p^2 \big(\Sigma_d \Sigma^\dagger_d\big) \Big[ D_{uL} D'_{dL} - D'_{uL} D_{dL} \Big] \Bigg\},
\end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mu^2_\ell = -\mathrm{i}\frac{1}{2} \int \frac{\mathrm{d}^4 p}{(2\pi)^4}\ \mathrm{Tr}\Bigg\{ & \Big[ \big(\Sigma_{\nu D} \Sigma^\dagger_{\nu D}\big) - \frac{1}{2} p^2 \big(\Sigma_{\nu D} \Sigma^\dagger_{\nu D}\big)' \Big] D_{eL} D_{\nu L} - \frac{1}{2} p^2 \big(\Sigma_{\nu D} \Sigma^\dagger_{\nu D}\big) \Big[ D_{eL} D'_{\nu L} - D'_{eL} D_{\nu L} \Big] \\
& + \Big[ \big(\Sigma_{\nu L} \Sigma^\dagger_{\nu L}\big) - \frac{1}{2} p^2 \big(\Sigma_{\nu L} \Sigma^\dagger_{\nu L}\big)' \Big] D_{eL} D_{\nu L} - \frac{1}{2} p^2 \big(\Sigma_{\nu L} \Sigma^\dagger_{\nu L}\big) \Big[ D_{eL} D'_{\nu L} - D'_{eL} D_{\nu L} \Big] \\
& + \Big[ \big(\Sigma^{\mathrm{T}}_{\nu D} \Sigma^\dagger_{\nu L}\big) - \frac{1}{2} p^2 \big(\Sigma^{\mathrm{T}}_{\nu D} \Sigma^\dagger_{\nu L}\big)' \Big] D_{eL} D_{\nu M} - \frac{1}{2} p^2 \big(\Sigma^{\mathrm{T}}_{\nu D} \Sigma^\dagger_{\nu L}\big) \Big[ D_{eL} D'_{\nu M} - D'_{eL} D_{\nu M} \Big] \\
& + \Big[ \big(\Sigma_{\nu R} \Sigma^\dagger_{\nu D}\big) - \frac{1}{2} p^2 \big(\Sigma_{\nu R} \Sigma^\dagger_{\nu D}\big)' \Big] D_{eL} D_{\nu M} - \frac{1}{2} p^2 \big(\Sigma_{\nu R} \Sigma^\dagger_{\nu D}\big) \Big[ D_{eL} D'_{\nu M} - D'_{eL} D_{\nu M} \Big] \\
& + \Big[ \big(\Sigma_e \Sigma^\dagger_e\big) - \frac{1}{2} p^2 \big(\Sigma_e \Sigma^\dagger_e\big)' \Big] D_{\nu L} D_{eL} - \frac{1}{2} p^2 \big(\Sigma_e \Sigma^\dagger_e\big) \Big[ D_{\nu L} D'_{eL} - D'_{\nu L} D_{eL} \Big] \Bigg\}.
\end{aligned} \tag{27}$$

We used here, besides the notation (20) for propagators of the charged fermions, also similar notation for the propagator of neutrinos:

$$\begin{pmatrix} D_{\nu L} & D_{\nu M} \\ D^\dagger_{\nu M} & D^{\mathrm{T}}_{\nu R} \end{pmatrix} = \big( p^2 - \Sigma_{\Psi_\nu} \Sigma^\dagger_{\Psi_\nu} \big)^{-1} \,. \tag{28}$$

The dimensions of the blocks $D_{\nu L}$, $D_{\nu R}$ and $D_{\nu M}$ correspond to those of blocks of $\Sigma_{\Psi_\nu}$, see (12).

Notice that in the limit of purely Dirac neutrinos, i.e., when $\Sigma_{\nu L}$ and $\Sigma_{\nu R}$ vanish, $D_{\nu M}$ vanishes too and $D_{\nu L}$ and $D_{\nu R}$ have the same meaning as the quantities (20) for charged fermions. The lepton contributions then have the same form as the quark contributions.

## V. COMPARISON WITH LITERATURE

While the formulae (25), (27) for contributions $\mu^2_\nu$, $\mu^2_\ell$ including the Majorana neutrinos are genuine new, the formulae analogous to (24), (26) for quarks contributions $\mu^2_{f=u,d}$, $\mu^2_q$ have already been derived in the literature [2]. They differ from our results by the coefficients at the derivative terms $(\Sigma_f \Sigma^\dagger_f)'$, which are twice as small than in (24), (26). This discrepancy is to be attributed to the value of the parameter $x$: While we set the non-vanishing value (21), the authors of [2] effectively set $x = 0$ by ignoring the terms of the type (4) in the vertices. The

reason why they did not found any inconsistency regarding the non-symmetricity of the gauge boson mass matrix (or different masses of the $W^+$ and $W^-$ bosons) was that they considered an oversimplified case of only one fermion generation and real quark self-energies $\Sigma_u$, $\Sigma_d$. Had they considered a more general case of $\Sigma_u$, $\Sigma_d$ being either *complex* or *matrices* (or both), they would have obtained a non-symmetric mass matrix for $W^\pm$ bosons, as can be seen from (19).

In [8] the masses of $W^\pm$ and $Z$ boson are obtained by calculating not the whole transversal polarization tensor, but only its $g^{\mu\nu}$ part. Besides assuming also only one fermion generation and real quark self-energies, the most crude assumption is setting $g' = 0$. Interestingly enough, the authors of [8] still do obtain the formulae equivalent (via integration by parts) to ours for $\mu^2_{f=u,d}$, $\mu^2_q$, including the correct factors of $1/2$ at the derivative terms. However, their method cannot be applied to more general cases like, e.g., theories with different gauge groups, and also upon relaxing the assumption $g' = 0$ it yields wrong results like, e.g., a massive photon.

It is natural to assume that the non-vanishing value (21) of the parameter $x$, derived in the context of electroweak interaction, should apply also to the Abelian model from Sec. II. Plugging this value into the formula (8) we obtain the corrected PS formula

$$F_\pi^2 = -2\mathrm{i}\int \frac{\mathrm{d}^4p}{(2\pi)^4}\frac{|\Sigma_p|^2 - \frac{1}{2}p^2|\Sigma_p|^{2\prime}}{(p^2 - |\Sigma_p|^2)^2}\,. \tag{29}$$

Notice that the difference from the original PS formula (5) is again just the factor of $1/2$ at the derivative term.

Pagels and Stokar used in [7] their formula (5) to estimate the value of $F_\pi$ in QCD. They adopted the Ansatz $\Sigma_p = 4m^3/p^2$ with the constituent quark mass $m = 244\,\mathrm{MeV}$. From their formula (5) they obtained (for two quark flavors) the estimate $F_\pi = 83\,\mathrm{MeV}$, which was surprisingly close to the experimental value $F_\pi = 93\,\mathrm{MeV}$. Had they used rather the corrected formula (29), they would have obtained $F_\pi = 96\,\mathrm{MeV}$, i.e., the agreement would have been actually even better.

## VI. CONCLUSIONS

The basic finding of this letter is genuine new term of the type (6) that can be added to the Ansatz for the proper vertex function $\langle A^\mu\psi\bar\psi\rangle$. This new term, although transversal, contains the NG pole, corresponding to the spontaneous breaking of the symmetry in question, and hence contributes to the gauge boson mass. It is not, due to its transversality, constrained by the WT identity and hence can be multiplied by any constant $x$.

We demonstrated that this new term is actually indispensable when calculating the mass matrix of the $W^\pm$ and $Z$ bosons, when the electroweak symmetry is spontaneously broken by fermion self-energies. We showed that the gauge boson mass matrix comes out in general non-symmetric, unless one considers the vertices with the new terms of the type (6) and with the parameter $x$ set to a specific *non-vanishing* value.

As a result we provided explicit formulae for the $W^\pm$ and $Z$ masses in terms of the fermion self-energies. In comparison with the similar formulae in the literature we have achieved two improvements. First, we have corrected them by considering non-vanishing value (21) of $x$, instead of $x = 0$. Second, we have generalized them by considering the most general setup with arbitrary number of generations (together with arbitrary mixing) and arbitrary number of right-handed neutrinos (together with left- and right-handed Majorana self-energies).

Finally, we have also found a correction to the PS formula for the pion decay constant in QCD, again by assuming the non-vanishing value (21) of $x$.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank Jiří Hošek and Adam Smetana for useful comments. The work was supported by the TJ Balvan Praha.

[1] Jiří Hošek, "Electroweak $SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$ gauge model without Higgs fields," CERN-TH-4104/85 (1985).

[2] V. A. Miransky, Masaharu Tanabashi, and Koichi Yamawaki, "Dynamical Electroweak Symmetry Breaking with Large Anomalous Dimension and t Quark Condensate," Phys. Lett. **B221**, 177 (1989).

[3] William A. Bardeen, Christopher T. Hill, and Manfred Lindner, "Minimal Dynamical Symmetry Breaking of the Standard Model," Phys. Rev. **D41**, 1647 (1990).

[4] Jiří Hošek, "Soft mass generation," (2009), arXiv:0909.0629 [hep-ph].

[5] Adam Smetana, "Sterile Particles from the Flavor Gauge Model of Masses," JHEP **1304**, 139 (2013), arXiv:1104.1935 [hep-ph].

[6] R. Jackiw and K. Johnson, "Dynamical Model of Spontaneously Broken Gauge Symmetries," Phys.Rev. **D8**, 2386–2398 (1973).

[7] Heinz Pagels and Saul Stokar, "The Pion Decay Constant, Electromagnetic Form-Factor and Quark Electromagnetic Selfenergy in QCD," Phys. Rev. **D20**, 2947 (1979).

[8] A. Blumhofer and M. Lindner, "Custodial $SU(2)$ violation and the origin of fermion masses," Nucl.Phys. **B407**, 173–190 (1993), arXiv:hep-ph/9304269 [hep-ph].